

EXHIBIT 5

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS)	
OF MICHIGAN, et al.,)	Case No. 2:17-cv-14148
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Hon. Eric L. Clay
)	Hon. Denise Page Hood
)	Hon. Gordon J. Quist
v.)	
)	LIST OF ENACTED DISTRICTS
)	THAT VIOLATE
)	SUB-SECTION (F)
RUTH JOHNSON, in her official)	
Capacity as Michigan)	
Secretary of State, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Below is a list of districts in the Michigan legislature's enacted plans, as created MCL § 3.51-3.55 (congressional districts) and MCL § 4.2001-4.2006 (state legislative districts), which disregard sub-section (f) of the Apol criteria, Mich. Comp. Laws § 4.261(f):

1. Enacted Senate District 22 violates subsection (f). First, it shifts 14 cities and townships in Washtenaw County into Livingston County when it could have shifted as few as 6. Second, even a shift of 14 could have been done with a smaller population shift. Thus, it also violates the second sentence of (f).

2. Enacted Senate District 24 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 5 cities and townships in Ingham County into the district when 2 could have been shifted.

3. Enacted Senate District 32 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 9 townships and cities from Genesee County into Saginaw County when as few as 6 could have been shifted.

4. Enacted House District 17 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 3 townships from Wayne County to Monroe County when it could have shifted only 2.

5. Enacted House District 32 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 7 townships from St. Clair County to Macomb County when it could have shifted 6.

6. Enacted House District 63 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 10 cities and townships in Kalamazoo County to Calhoun County when only 9 needed to be shifted.

7. Enacted House District 72 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 4 cities and townships in Allegan County to Kent County when 4 with lower population could have been shifted, in violation of second sentence of subsection (f).

8. Enacted House District 86 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 6 cities and townships in Ionia County to Kent County when 6 with smaller population could have been shifted, in violation of the second sentence of subsection (f).

9. Enacted House District 98 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 9 cities and townships from Bay County into Midland County when only 8 needed to be shifted.

10. Enacted House District 99 violates subsection (f) because it shifts 10 cities and townships from Midland County into Isabella when only 8 needed to be shifted.

11. Enacted House District 102 violates subsection (f) because it shifted 7 cities and townships from Osceola County when only 6 needed to be shifted.

12. Enacted House District 107 violates subsection (f) because it shifted 7 townships when 6 could have been shifted.